## **Utilization Review Performance Rating of Investigation of a Claims Administrator**

**Investigation No:** URA-S17-10-R1

Claims Administrator: City of San Diego/Risk Management

**Location:** San Diego

Utilization Review Management: City of San Diego; Intracorp

<b>Number of Requests for Author</b>	ization:	<b>Decisions by Type</b>	:	
Prospective 40		Approval	34	_
Concurrent 0		Modification	1	-
Retrospective 0		Delay	0	•
•		Denial	5	-
				-
1. FACTOR FOR UNTIMELY RESPONSE TO				
# late prospective responses		vide by # of prospective requests	40	
# late concurrent responses		vide by # of concurrent requests	0	
# late retrospective responses		vide by # of retrospective requests	0	-
Totals	0 div	vide by Totals	40	=
				0.00000
2. FACTOR FOR FAULTY NOTICE CONTE	NT			
# faulty prospective responses		ride by # of prospective requests	40	
# faulty prospective responses  # faulty concurrent responses		ride by # of concurrent requests	0	
# faulty retrospective responses		ride by # of retrospective requests	0	
Totals		ride by " of retrospective requests ride by Totals	40	_
Totals	o uiv	rac by Totals	40	0.00000
				0.00000
3. FACTOR FOR IMPROPER DISTRIBUTIO	N OF NOT	ICE		
# prospective w/ improper distribution	0 div	vide by # of prospective requests	40	
# concurrent w/ improper distribution		vide by # of concurrent requests	0	
# retrospective w/ improper distribution	0 div	vide by # of retrospective requests	0	_
Totals	0	Totals	40	
			=	0.00000
LIEU IZATION DEVIEW DEDECTMANCE				100.00/
UTILIZATION REVIEW PERFORMANCE				100.0%
A Utilization Review Performance Rating of	0.85000 of	r greater is a passing score.		

Calendar Year: 2010 Page 1 of 2

## Analysis of Penalties and/or Violations Cited for Utilization Review Investigation

**Investigation No.:** URA-S17-10-R1

Claims Administrator: City of San Diego/Risk Management

**Location:** San Diego

**Utilization Review Management:** City of San Diego; Intracorp

Number of Utilization Review Requests for Authorization (requests) for Quarter: 127
Requests reviewed: 40 Complaints Reviewed: 0

Type of Violation	Violation of Title 8, CCR §9792.12	# of Violation s	Total \$ Violations Identified	*\$ Not Subject to Assessment	Total \$ Subject to Assessment
Failure to establish a utilization review plan.	§9792.12 (a)(1)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to maintain a UR plan conforming to all of the requirements of 8CCR§9792.7(a).	§9792.12 (a)(2)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to file a UR plan or letter in lieu of UR plan with the Administrative Director.	§9792.12 (a)(3)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to timely file any material modification of a UR plan with the Administrative Director.	§9792.12 (a)(4)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to employ or designate a physician as medical director of the UR process.	§9792.12 (a)(5)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Issuance of a decision to modify or delay a request which is not within the reviewer's scope of practice.	§9792.12 (a)(6)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Modification, delay or denial of a request by a non- physician.	§9792.12 (a)(7)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Approval of amended request by non-physician without written evidence for submission of amended request.	§9792.12 (a)(8)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to timely respond to an expedited request.	§9792.12 (a)(9)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Denial of request solely because it is not addressed by MTUS/ACOEM.	§9792.12 (a)(10)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to document discussion for care plan for denial of concurrent request.	§9792.12 (a)(11)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
No response to non-expedited concurrent request.	§9792.12 (a)(12)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
No response to non-expedited prospective request.	§9792.12 (a)(13)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
No response to a retrospective request.	§9792.12 (a)(14)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to disclose UR guidelines to the public.	§9792.12 (a)(15)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure of URO or claims administrator to provide documentation of compliance pursuant to 8CCR§9792.11(v)(5).	§9792.12 (a)(16)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to timely comply with any compliance requirement for the Final Report of UR Investigation.	§9792.12 (a)(17)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Calendar Year: 2010 Page 2 of 2

## Analysis of Penalties and/or Violations Cited for Utilization Review Investigation

**Investigation No.:** URA-S17-10-R1

Claims Administrator: City of San Diego/Risk Management

**Location:** San Diego

**Utilization Review Management:** City of San Diego; Intracorp

	(b)(4)(F)		Ψ0	ΨΟ	Ψ0
Failure to provide UR criteria/guidelines when requested by patient.  Failure to make a timely request for additional	§9792.12 (b)(4)(F)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
information needed for decision for prospective/ concurrent request.	\$9792.12 (b)(5)(A)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide timely initial communication of approval for a prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(B)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide timely notice to all parties of decision to modify, delay, or deny a prospective/ concurrent request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(C)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide timely notice to all parties decision for a retrospective request.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(D)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to immediately notify the requesting party that decision cannot be made within timeframes.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(E)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to document need/basis to delay decision.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(F)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Failure to provide in written notice the reason for delay in making a decision.	§9792.12 (b)(5)(G)	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Absent a time extension, failure to make a timely decision for a prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.9 (b)(1)	0	N/A	N/A	\$0
Absent a time extension, failure to provide a timely written notice of decision for a prospective/ concurrent request.	§9792.9 (b)(3)	0	N/A	N/A	\$0
Absent a time extension, failure to provide initial notice for modification, delay or denial of a prospective/concurrent request.	§9792.9 (b)(4)	0	N/A	N/A	\$0
1 2000	<del>i</del>				

<sup>\*</sup>Penalties for violations in 8 CCR § 9792.12(a) are mandatory and cannot be waived but may be mitigated depending on factors in § 9792.13. Penalties under § 9792.12(b)(4) and (b)(5) may be waived per § 9792.12(b)(2) and mitigated per § 9792.13.